

**BOARD OF APPEALS CASE NO. 4822**

\*

**BEFORE THE**

**APPLICANT: Charles Krohn**

\*

**ZONING HEARING EXAMINER**

**REQUEST: Variance to enlarge the  
parking area more than 50% of the  
front yard; 2010 Tiffany Terrace, Forest Hill**

\*

**OF HARFORD COUNTY**

\*

**Hearing Advertised**

\*

**Aegis: 5/13/98 & 5/20/98**

**HEARING DATE: July 6, 1998**

\*

**Record: 5/15/98 & 5/22/98**

\* \* \* \* \*

### **ZONING HEARING EXAMINER'S DECISION**

The Applicant, Charles G. Krohn, is requesting a variance pursuant to Section 267-25(A)(5) of the Harford County Code to enlarge the parking area in the front yard more than the allowed 50% of the front yard in an R2 Urban Residential (COS) District.

The subject property is located at 2010 Tiffany Terrace, Forest Hill, Maryland 21050 and is more particularly identified on Tax Map 40, Grid 2D, Parcel 407. The property is located within the Rosefelds at Forest Lakes, Phase I subdivision, consists of 0.082 acres and is entirely within the Third Election District. The parcel is presently zoned R2/COS.

Mr. Charles G. Krohn appeared and testified that he was the owner of the subject property. Mr. Krohn testified that he owns a mid-unit townhouse with a single car garage. His existing driveway is 10 feet wide. He often needs to park his car in the street and it has been hit by passing cars in the past. The witness stated that the road in front of his house is very narrow. The Applicant pointed out that 58 similar lots were approved for a similar variance in his neighborhood pursuant to Board of Appeals Case No. 4391. By adding an additional 8 feet to his driveway he will exceed the 50% requirement by a small margin (58% resulting). Newer townhouse have been designed with 18 foot driveways and the Applicant's proposed enlargement would be no different than driveways presently existing in the neighborhood. The witness has obtained Homeowner's Association approval for the enlargement and stated that his adjoining neighbors were not opposed to the variance request. He believes his property is unique because it was not originally built with an 18 foot driveway as most of the other homes have been in the neighborhood and that his located on a very narrow street which makes on-street parking hazardous.

## Case No. 4822 - Charles Krohn

The Department of Planning and Zoning investigated the Applicant's request and committed its findings to a staff report dated June 16, 1998. The Department confirmed the Applicant's description of the neighborhood and the existing 18 foot driveways. Further, the Department concluded that allowance of the Applicant's request would have no detrimental impact on adjacent properties or other homes within the neighborhood. Additionally, the Applicant's proposed drive would be consistent with those of other homes already existing and proposed in the neighborhood.

There were no persons who appeared in opposition to the Applicant's request.

### CONCLUSION:

Section 267-25(A)(5) of the Harford County Code provides as follows:

"Parking areas on residential lots shall not cover more than fifty percent (50%) of the required front yard."

The Harford County Code, pursuant to Section 267-11 permits area variances provided the Board finds that:

- (1) By reason of the uniqueness of the property or topographical conditions, the literal enforcement of this Code would result in practical difficulty or unreasonable hardship.**
- (2) The variance will not be substantially detrimental to adjacent properties or will not materially impair the purpose of this Code or the public interest.**

The Hearing Examiner concludes that the subject property is unique in that it has a smaller drive than other homes in the neighborhood and is located on a narrow street making on-street parking impractical. Additionally, the Board has already granted similar variances to over 50 homes in this neighborhood allowing enlargement of those driveways to 18 feet. The Applicant, if denied, would lose rights to which other property owners have been entitled. Both the Applicant and the Department have provided adequate evidence that the enlargement of the existing driveway will have no detrimental impact to adjoining properties or the surrounding neighborhood.

**Case No. 4822 - Charles Krohn**

The Hearing Examiner therefore recommends that the subject Application be approved subject to the following two conditions:

1. The proposed driveway not exceed 18 feet in width.
2. The Applicant obtain all necessary permits and inspections.

**Date JULY 28, 1998**

**William F. Casey  
Zoning Hearing Examiner**